

Responses to Oral Comments

July 22, 2002 Draft Interim Report

Informal notes were taken at the eight public forums to discuss the draft Interim Report for the purpose of recording issues and concerns with the report content. These notes have been reviewed, summarized, and recorded in the attached Public Forum Oral Comment Summary, a process that has identified over three hundred comments. Although there is not a separate, individual response for these oral comments, they are addressed either through revisions to the report text or in the responses to written comments. For the most part, oral comments made at the public forums were also submitted as written comments.

Some comments had to do with issues other than considering processes to change the flood management system and are topics not addressed through reporting procedures. For example, issues that are essentially lobbying for new legislation or changes in existing legislation are not appropriate report recommendations or conclusions. These issues and concerns are, however, included in the report as stakeholder concerns. Some other comments pertained to issues that require greater detail than is available at the programmatic level of the interim report. These issues and concerns will be fully addressed in future, more detailed planning studies.

One comment not addressed elsewhere is a recommendation to build a water barrier across San Pablo Bay. While this recommendation could theoretically benefit water quality in the Delta, it would be too far downstream to be potentially responsive to the flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration problems and planning objectives along the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Furthermore, this proposal has been previously considered by other resource planning and management entities that have concluded the related environmental issues make it unimplementable.

In addition to oral comments made at the public forums, oral public comments on the Comprehensive Plan were also made at the August 16, 2002 meeting of the Reclamation Board. The transcribed minutes of that meeting were reviewed to identify the oral comments and insure that they are addressed in the text of the report or in the responses to written comments. Again, these oral comments essentially restated comments that had been made in writing, and are responded to elsewhere in this document.

The only comment made at the Reclamation Board meeting that is not addressed elsewhere is the observation that widening the floodway between levees will reduce the number of acres protected by those levees, which will, in turn, reduce the revenue for levee maintenance. This one of several implementation issues that will be addressed as necessary during future, project specific planning studies. A process for resolving these implementation issues is part of the Comprehensive Plan